



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,789	06/21/2006	Kimmo Jyrinki	IHN.080.WUS	6884
10888	7590	12/23/2011	EXAMINER	
Hollingsworth & Funk 8500 Normandale Lake Blvd., Suite 320 Minneapolis, MN 55437			KEATON, SHERROD L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2175	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/23/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tdotter@hfiplaw.com
roswood@hfiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/583,789	JYRINKI, KIMMO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHERROD KEATON	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 13, 14 and 18-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-5, 8-10, 13-14, 18-25 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to pre-appeal decision on 10-18-2011. Claims 1, 4-5, 8-10, 13-14, 18-25 are pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 20, 24 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-5, 8-10, 13-14, 18-19, 21-23, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mansikkaniemi et al., US 2002/0063732 (Hereinafter, Mansikkaniemi) in view of McCarthy et al., 20020044149 A1 (Hereinafter, McCarthy)

Regarding Claim 1, “a method comprising: facilitating user entry of one or more calendar entries into a terminal, wherein the entries each include a time of an event and a user composed calendar note describing the event”. Specifically, the user of the terminal first selects a particular day and then new calendar event view is shown in the display. A virtual keyboard is shown so that the new event can be typed and other information regarding its occurrence can also be determined (Masnikkaniemi, ¶0048).

Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “selecting in the terminal at least one calendar profile for generating calendar content to be shared”. Specifically, any member of the family can look at and add to the family calendar and also look at and add to their private calendar, but cannot look at and add to another’s calendar (Mansikkaniemi, ¶0048).

Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “associating the one or more calendar notes with one or more calendar profiles in a terminal” Specifically, associating the event so that a family member can look at the and add to the family calendar (Mansikkaniemi, ¶0048). The family member view and individual view of the calendar would be the calendar profile

Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “generating the calendar content to be shared on the basis of at least one selected calendar profile”. Specifically, any member of the family can look at and add to the family calendar and also look at and add to their private calendar, but cannot look at and add to another’s calendar (Mansikkaniemi,

Art Unit: 2175

¶0048).

Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “establishing a connection between the terminal and at least one user terminal for transmitting or loading the calendar content to be shared to the at least one user terminal”. Specifically, the authenticated group member may change the group calendar content according to given command in such a way, that other authorized members of the same group get the latest group calendar information from the server (Mansikkaniemi, ¶0040).

Mansikkaniemi does not specifically discloses, “detecting a text pattern in one or more calendar notes” and “on the basis of the detected text patterns each calendar profile defining a unique view to the calendar entries”. However, this is remedied by McCarthy disclosure which provides a system which analyzes text patterns in messages which include calendar notes in order to correlate the data with a unique profile (abstract, Paragraph 33, claim 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the functionality of analyzing the text to map with a profile and calendar of Mansikkaniemi as taught by McCarthy. One would have been motivated to provide this functionality to gather sources of information and allow the calendaring system to more efficiently deliver and utilize relevant material.

Regarding Claim 4, Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “the method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising generating the calendar content to be shared as defined by the selected user profile based on a remote device, user group, purpose of use or time

Art Unit: 2175

of day”. Specifically, any member of the family can look at and add to the family calendar and also look at and add to their private calendar, but cannot look at and add to another’s calendar (Mansikkaniemi, ¶¶0048). There also is day view or a month arrangement (Mansikkaniemi, ¶¶0044).

Regarding Claims 5, 8, applicant claims a system to perform the method of claims 1, 4. These claims are substantially similar to claims 1, 4 and are therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claims 1, 4.

Regarding Claim 9, Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “the communications system as claimed in claim 5, wherein the second user terminal is a media device, computer, PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) device or mobile station”. Specifically, Mansikkaniemi discloses a computer and wireless terminals Mansikkaniemi, ¶¶0023-24).

Regarding Claims 10, applicant claims a terminal that performs the method of claim 1. These claims are substantially similar to claim 1 and are therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 13, this claim is substantially similar to claim 9 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 9.

Regarding Claim 14, this claim is substantially similar to claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 18, Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “the method of claim 1, wherein generating the calendar content to be shared on the basis of at least one selected calendar profile comprised modifying the calendar notes associated with the shared calendar content”. Specifically, the designation of the event of an either to be listed on the family or individual calendar would be the identifier (Masnikkaniemi, ¶0048). The user is able to create and edit events in the same views of the system where the information is presented (Masnikkaniemi, ¶0046).

Regarding Claim 19, Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “the method of claim 18, wherein the calendar profile comprises a work profile, and wherein modifying the content comprises removing non-work-related personal information from the content”. Specifically, the designation of the event of an either to be listed on the family or individual calendar would be the identifier (Masnikkaniemi, ¶0048). Family would be equivalent to the work profile and individual would be equivalent to the persona profile.

Regarding Claim 21, Mansikkaniemi also discloses, “the method of claim 18, wherein modifying the calendar notes associated with the shared calendar content comprises providing a modified note to describe user availability in the context of both the calendar profile and on the basis of times of day associated with the calendar

Art Unit: 2175

entries". The user is able to create and edit events in the same views of the system where the information is presented (Masnikkaniemi, ¶0046). This includes changing the times and days of events.

Regarding Claims 22-23, 25, these claims are substantially similar to claims 18-21 and are therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claims 18-21.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant further argues that generation in the system is performed by the apparatus and not the user. However the claim language does not exclude the user from performing the generation using the apparatus. Applicant is invited to further clarify the claims if they wish to exclude any user interaction.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

Art Unit: 2175

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

12-8-2011

/William Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175